FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

A REGISTERED LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP 666 FIFTH AVENUE, 31ST FLOOR NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10103-3198 WWW.FULBRIGHT.COM

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

DATE:

December 27, 2002

MATTER NUMBER:

RECIPIENT(S):	FAX No.:	PHONE NO.:	
Examiner A. DeCloux	703-746-4982	09807811	!
USPTO, Group 1644			

FROM:

Norman Hanson

User id:

NH01030

FLOOR:

PHONE:

Message:

(212) 318-3168

FAX:

(212) 318-3400

RE:

LUD 5466.4

Number of Pages with Cover Page:

	•	

CAUTION - CONFIDENTIAL THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY ALSO CONTAIN PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY-CLIENT INFORMATION OR WORK PRODUCT. THE INFORMATION IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT. YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE FACSIMILE IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE, AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS ABOVE VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK: YOU.

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL OF :	THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL
AT	AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

LUD 5466.4 CIP - NDH (09807811)

VIA FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on December 27, 2002.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s)

Alexander, et al.

Serial No

09/165,546

Filed

October 2, 1998

For

CORRESPONDING

ACID SEQUENCES OF NY-ESO-1...

Art Unit

1644

Examiner

A. Decloux

December 27, 2002

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE TO TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY AND ADVISORY ACTION AND AMENDMENT

This is in response to the papers mailed by the examiner on December 18.

With respect to the examiner interview summary sheet, the recitation of the substance of the telephone interview is correct.

With respect to the advisory action, yet again the examiner has changed her position, and has indicated that claims previously deemed allowable are not. Please compare paper number 38 (copy attached) indicating that claims 89-91 and 95 would be allowable. Now, in paper number 40, the examiner states they are not.

The examiner cannot reverse position without reopening prosecution. This has been pointed out before, and apparently has been ignored.

25245915.1